NEW YORK JOURNAL AND ADVERTISER
W. R. HEARST.

AN AMERICAN PAPER FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

AN AMERICAN INTERNAL POLICY.

FIRST—PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF PUBLIC FRANCHISES.

The Values Created by the Community Should Belong to the Community.

SECOND—DESTRUCTION OF CRIMINAL TRUSTS.

No Monopolization of the National Resources by Lawless Private Combinations More Powerful Than the People's Government.

THIRD—A GRADUATED INCOME TAX.

Every Citizen to Contribute to the Support of the Government According to His Means, and Not According to His Necessities.

FOURTH—ELECTION OF SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.

The Senate, Now Becoming the Private Property of Corporations and Bosses, to Be Made Truly Representative, and the State Legislatures to Be Redeemed from Recurring Scandals.

FIFTH—NATIONAL, STATE AND MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM.

As the Duties of Citizenship Are Both General and Local, Every Government, General and Local, Should Do Its Share Toward Fitting Every Individual to Perform Them.

SIXTH—CURRENCY REFORM.

All the Nation's Money to be Issued by the Nation's Government, and Its Supply to Be Regulated by the People and Not by the Banks.

REPUBLICAN SHELTER FOR TRUSTS.

Attorney-General Griggs informs the public that the Anti-Trust law is entirely worthless for the suppression of trusts, and he is evidently glad of it. This law, it may be remembered, was passed for the exclusive purpose of curbing those gigantic combinations of capital which even in 1890 were paralyzing independent industry in the United States, and which have grown to so much more terrifying proportions since. Nobody dreamed at that time of the possibility of giving it any other application. It could not have received a vote on any other understanding, yet absolutely the **only use** to which it has been put by the Government and the courts has been to secure the **imprisonment of striking workmen on railroads.** The officials charged with its enforcement have made up for their cheerful impotence against such monstrous growths as the thousand-million dollar Coal Trust by the intensity of their zeal in bombarding penniless workers with the broadsides of their anti-trust batteries.

While Mr. Griggs says in so many words that he does not consider trusts harmful to the country, the excuse he advances for refusing to enforce the law against them is that they are not subject to Federal jurisdiction. "The Sherman Trust act," he explains, "does not give the Federal courts jurisdiction over any combination constituting a restraint and monopoly of trade, unless such trade is what is known as interstate or international trade and commerce."

A combination or trust for the purpose of maintaining a monopoly in the manufacture of a necessary of life is not within the scope of the Sherman act, and cannot be suppressed by the Federal courts. This was decided in 1894, in the case of the United States against the combination of sugar companies.

How does the Attorney-General reconcile this position with the notorious facts in relation to the Coal Trust? Here is a combination of railroads and coal mines operated in at least three States. The coal is mined in Pennsylvania, carried by the transportation lines of the Trust across the boundaries of Pennsylvania, New Jersey and New York, and sold in all three commonwealths, as well as in many others. This Trust is engaged in interstate commerce if any agency ever was. It is a combination in restraint of trade among the States. If the Attorney-General does not believe it, let him try to bring a carload of anthracite coal to New York without the consent of this Trust.

There is so much interstate activity in most trusts that it is impossible for State authorities to get at them. Of course, Federal laws will be of no use, either, as long as they are administered by **men who do not want to enforce them.**

The best service the **DEMOCRACY** can render to the country and itself is to replace officials like Attorney-General Griggs with public servants who will

CRUSH THE CRIMINAL TRUSTS.

SULTAN GERRY'S "GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY."

The Gerry Society violently opposed to any interruption of his continues to be run profitable industry.

on its usual high-handed lines. It has become an instrument of oppression to the poor, whose children it was organized to protect. The case of Mrs. O'Brien, who was arraigned in the Yorkville Police Court yesterday, will illustrate the unfairness and heartlessness of one of its agents. Gerry Agent Fogarty had arrested her six-year-old boy on the charge of begging. When the case was called Fogarty informed Magistrate Cornell that Mrs. O'Brien had come to the rooms of the society and disrespectfully referred to the distinguished owner of the Windsor Hotel as "Gerry." Mrs. O'Brien explained that she was trying to find her boy, and that in her anxiety she may have been guilty of the heinous offence of which she was accused. The agent assured the Magistrate that the woman was drunk.

Upon this unsupported statement she was sentenced to the workhouse for a month. Her husband made an ineffectual plea for her. She has nine children, the youngest six months old. Two of the children were in court, and the Gerry agent took possession of them on the ground that they were without guardianship, the mother having been taken to the workhouse in default of bail.

The Gerry Society claims to be a law in itself. It has declined to permit the State Board of Charities to examine into its affairs. Superintendent Jenkins, of the society, charges $5 a week for boarding each child committed to his care, and as the number averages forty throughout the year, he is

The Legislature should investigate the workings of the Gerry Society, and give the State Board of Charities the right to supervise its work.

ALGER'S POISONED BEEF.

The court of inquiry, having completed the taking of testimony at Chicago, is on its way to New York, where Governor Roosevelt and other witnesses will be summoned. Each day adds to the overwhelming evidence that the beef sold to the Government for the use of the soldiers was offensive to the taste and smell, lacking in nutrition and utterly unfit for food.

Dr. E. E. Murdoch, for two years President of the auxiliary medical staff of the Chicago Health Department, made important revelations as to the quality of beef furnished by the Chicago packers. He had made several examinations of canned and refrigerated beef, dating back several years. In a can of boiled beef he found a quantity of common salt, and also nitrate of potash. These preservatives had saturated the fibre of the meat and hardened it.

In reference to his examination of fresh beef, Dr. Murdoch said:

I found salt in a small quantity, and some of the meat was coated with boracic acid. In other specimens I found that they had been coated with a preparation of salicylic acid for preserving the meat. I gave the opinion that salicylic acid was not only detrimental to digestion, but produced nausea. Boracic acid, while in itself not nauseating, delays the process of digestion, and hence is not a fit preservative for meat used as a diet. I understood this to be refrigerator beef. I found boracic acid in two specimens and salicylic acid in one. These experiments were made about the middle of June, 1898.

If chemically treated meat was sold in the open market in Chicago, isn't it reasonable to suppose that in the mad rush to swindle the Government the same character of beef was shipped to the Southern camps and to Cuba? Dr. Daly has testified that he found boracic and salicylic acid in beef bought by the Commissary Department for use in the army. The Alger whitewashing commission rejected this testimony, which has since been corroborated by witnesses before the court of inquiry.

With the facts already before it, the court cannot fail to report that the charges made by General Miles have been fully substantiated.

HOW HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF.

There were many points of resemblance between the Spanish war and the war with Mexico, which ended half a century earlier. Here is what General Grant, in his "Personal Memoirs," said of one aspect of the Mexican incident.

"The Mexican war was a political war, and the Administration conducting it desired to make party capital out of it. General Scott was at the head of the army, and, being a soldier of acknowledged professional capacity, his claim to the command of the forces in the field was almost indisputable, and does not seem to have been denied by President Polk, or Marcy, his Secretary of War. Scott was a Whig, and the Administration was Democratic. General Scott was also known to have political aspirations, and nothing so popularizes a candidate for high civil positions as military victories. It would not do, therefore, to give him command of the 'army of conquest.' The plans submitted by Scott for a campaign in Mexico were disapproved by the Administration, and he replied, in a tone possibly a little disrespectful, to the effect that, if a soldier's plans were not to be supported by the Administration, success could not be expected. This was on the 27th of May, 1846. Four days later General Scott was notified that he need not go to Mexico.

"General Gaines was next in rank, but he was too old and feeble to take the field. Colonel Zachary Taylor—a Brigadier General by brevet—was therefore left in command. He, too, was a Whig, but he was not supposed to entertain any political ambitions; nor did he; but after the fall of Monterey, his third battle and third complete victory, the Whig papers at home began to speak of him as a candidate of their party for the Presidency. Something had to be done to neutralize his growing popularity. He could not be relieved from duty in the field, where all his battles had been victories; the design would have been too transparent. It was finally decided to send General Scott to Mexico in chief command, and to authorize him to carry out his own original plan; that is, capture Vera Cruz and march upon the capital of the country. It was no doubt supposed that Scott's ambition would lead him to slaughter Taylor or destroy his chances for the Presidency, and yet it was hoped that he would not make sufficient capital himself to secure the prize.

"The Administration had indeed a most embarrassing problem to solve. It was engaged in a war of conquest, which must be carried to a successful issue or the political object would be unattained. Yet all the capable officers of the requisite rank belonged to the opposition, and the man selected for his lack of political ambition had himself become a prominent candidate for the Presidency. It was necessary to destroy his chances promptly. The problem was to do this without the loss of conquest and without permitting another General of the same political party to acquire like popularity. **The fact is, the Administration of Mr. Polk made every preparation to disgrace Scott, or, to speak more correctly, to drive him to such desperation that he would disgrace himself.** * * * Scott had scarcely started for Mexico before the President undertook to supersede him by the appointment of Senator Thomas A. Benton as Lieutenant-General. * * * Congress failed to accede to this proposition, and Scott remained in command, but every General appointed to serve under him was politically opposed to the chief, and several were personally hostile. * * *

"Soon after entering the city of Mexico, the opposition of Generals Pillow, Worth and Colonel Duncan to General Scott became very marked. Scott claimed that they had demanded of the President his removal. I do not know whether this is so or not, but I do know of their unconcealed hostility to their chief. At last he placed them in arrest, and preferred charges against them of insubordination and disrespect. * * * About the middle of February orders came convening a court of inquiry, * * * and shortly afterward orders were received from Washington relieving Scott of command of the armies in the field. This order also released Pillow, Worth and Duncan from arrest. * * * It is quite possible the vanity of the General (Scott) had led him to say and do things that afforded a plausible pretext to the Administration for doing just what it did, and what it had wanted to do from the start. **The court tried the accuser quite as much as the accused.** * * *

"The efforts to kill off politically the two successful Generals made them both candidates for the Presidency. General Taylor was nominated in 1848, and was elected. Four years later General Scott received the nomination, but was badly beaten."

EVERY MEMBER of the Pennsylvania Legislature must appear before an investigating committee and state, under oath, whether any attempt has been made to influence his vote improperly in the Senatorial contest. This will give some of Quay's supporters an opportunity to perjure themselves like gentlemen.

SENATOR PLATT will spend a week at the Executive Mansion as the guest of Governor Roosevelt. An unexpurgated edition of the thoughts of Rev. Dr. Parkhurst on this subject would make mighty interesting reading.

WHAT SHALL THE PARTY DO TO BE SAVED?

(From the Albany Argus, Long the Official Organ of the Democratic State Organization.)

ALBANY, N. Y., March 23.—The Albany Argus, in a two-column editorial, replies to William J. Bryan's views as expressed in his declination of the Democratic Club dinner invitation. The Argus concedes Mr. Bryan's absolute right to decline the invitation for any reason, or for no reason at all; but says that he has made the declination the occasion for promulgating two distinct propositions:

First—He clearly assumes that he is again to be the Democratic nominee for President next year.

Second—He as positively assumes that the Chicago platform will be reaffirmed without change as to its principal features.

Not a delegate to the Democratic National Convention of 1900 has yet been chosen; yet Mr. Bryan talks as if a majority of that convention had already reaffirmed the platform of 1896, and as if two-thirds of that convention had already voted to make him again the nominee. In other words, it is no longer a question of bolting the decrees of a convention; it is now a question, so Mr. Bryan says, of accepting, more than a year in advance, one man's opinions as to what should be the platform and who should be the nominee of that convention, upon pain of being proscribed (so far as Mr. Bryan has power to proscribe) as no Democrat.

The Argus then proceeds to discuss the matter in its broader aspects, remarking that as Mr. Bryan was defeated in 1896 upon the platform upon which he now proposes to run again, without change, he must, in order to be elected, make gains before the people and in the electoral college.

"He wants," says the Argus, "no support from Democrats who do not accept the Chicago platform in its entirety; thus he would eliminate New York, Connecticut and New Jersey from the possibility of being Democratic next year at the start—for we suppose that no well-informed observer claims that there are enough men who accept the Chicago platform in its entirety to carry either of those three States. Where is the deficiency of votes to be made up?"

The Argus then quotes from the election tables of 1898 the figures showing heavy Democratic losses in Kansas, Wyoming, Washington, Oregon, California and the middle West, and almost the loss of Nebraska itself, and continues:

"Devotion to principle is admirable, in man or party, but conditions change, issues gain or lose in importance, new ideas and situations arise, and unwise to the point of downright folly is the man or party all of whose eggs are in one basket, and that eternally prates upon the merits of a lost cause and insists upon making it the only or paramount issue. It is not only that such a policy means present defeat—a great party can survive many defeats, although no party can hope to survive unless it sometimes wins—but that the inevitable result of unwise leadership is that the party loses its young men, which is precisely what has already begun to happen to the Democratic party. This is a danger signal of the most alarming sort, showing that there must be a cessation of the policy of narrowness and proscription, else Democracy may not survive.

"Can the party afford to have men who want to be Democrats proscribed in advance of its national conventions, and that by a man who, if we mistake not, himself announced that he would turn Populist unless the convention of 1896 adopted a free-silver platform?

"Can the South, now that Populism is no longer a great menace, now that there is no longer a doubt that most of the Southern States can be carried for Democracy, no matter what the platform may be, afford to destroy the Democratic party in the North? Is all that the Northern Democracy has done for the South since the war so soon forgotten? Is the history of the Force bill obsolete?

"A hand organ, grinding out the same old tunes, cannot expect to hold the crowd as against a fire or a fight down the street. A party forever singing a song of sixteen to one cannot attract the people when, so far as national matters go, their attention is largely absorbed in war issues."

ALAN DALE VIEWS MELODRAMA.

LONDON LIFE AS PLAYED AT THE COLUMBUS.

IF we obtained all our ideas of London life from melodramas we should be tempted to believe that the English metropolis was laid out expressly for the "foiling" of double-distilled villains. We should suppose that all the "low types" existed merely as ornaments for the heroine in her persecuted moments. As for English baronets—well, they would simply illustrate the proverb that says "Give a dog a bad name and hang him." I have no doubt that the melodrama-mongers of this city have ideas of London that would cause Baedeker's hair to stand on end. Everything is extreme in the melodramas that deal with the English metropolis. It is a case of the little girl who had a little curl.

At the Columbus Theatre Messrs. J. Duke Murray and Howard Long are exploiting a brand new play, which has cooks enough to spoil any broth. It is called "London Life," and it was adapted from "Le Camelot" of Paul Audry, Max Maurey and George Jubin by Martin Field and Arthur Shirley. Five gentlemen had a finger apiece in this little pie. One of these days the authors and producers of melodramas will appear in a little booklet, in alphabetical order, all by themselves. They take up a great deal of valuable space.

It is rare, however, that such a good specimen of conventional melodrama as "London Life" is seen in the "combination" houses. Messrs. Murray and Long have a winner in a play that has no "sensation"—such as a nice red explosion or a human ladder. It succeeds simply because its trite story is well displayed and because its "street" types are human enough. The ladies of One Hundred and Twenty-fifth street wept bitterly last night at the woes of the heroine and laughed—in the wrong place—at the amorous atrocities of the villainess. They grew pale at the spectacle of me-child in a nightie (the nightie is always used for pathos in melodrama, as opposed to the pajamas that signify comedy) rushing into her poor mother's arms. In a word, they thoroughly enjoyed themselves.

"London Life" begins very riskily for popular price melodrama. In fact, it looked very much as though "Mrs. Tanqueray" were in the five authors' minds. Think of a brazen lady, clad in sweeping organdie (I am told that it was organdie. It is a nice word) seeking to wed her illicit lover to her own stepdaughter, so that he might obtain the spondulix! But "problems" don't go north of Forty-second street, and the Columbus Theatre howled with laughter when this spicy lady begged her Stephen to marry Gladys, and then threw herself into his arms, exclaiming that she loved him and that she was his. "Ain't she funny?" the girl behind me remarked, as she burst into laughter, and positively declined to be vexed. Downtown every critic would have cried "Unpleasant!" and every critic's wife would have said "Take me home, love, and see if you can't write your views without me." But at the Columbus they accept the good and smile incredulously at the evil, which is quite as it should be.

The amours of the wicked siren, however, were merely preparatory to the usual melodramatic anguish. Gladys happened to hear the scene between her step-maternal parent and the fickle Stephen She promptly declared that she would sooner die than marry him, and instantly jumped into a featherbed Thames, from which she was rescued by Happy Jack.

After that six years elapsed, and you saw Gladys as the mother of a child who must have been at least nine. Mr. Gerry, I understand, interfered with a seven-year-older's appearance, quite regardless of the heroine's youth and of her six years of wedded life. According to Mr. Gerry, no heroine has the right to be the mother of anything under eight. Consequently, playwrights will please make their lapse of time to exceed six years.

MISS LILLIAN LAMSON.

Gladys had been turned out of doors. Her father had not said, "Henceforth you are no chee-yild of mine." He had more originally declared that he never wanted to look upon her face again. So she ran away and married Lieutenant Harry Maxwell. Then the agony began. Harry loved her so intensely that he left her penniless in London while he went to South Africa because he couldn't endure poverty.

This gave a fine opportunity for a fetching pawnbroker's scene, showing Happy Jack hypothecating his coat and waistcoat to pay her rent. It gave me-child a chance to lie, ill in her bedstead, with a calcium on her face. And it allowed Gladys to utter maniacal shrieks when she gave her child over to her father to clothe and feed, in sweet maternal sacrifice.

Later on, she went home, and confronted the siren in a deep black dress. The siren wore flaming red, with silver knots all over it, and a haughty train. Gladys swore she would tell her father everything, and the siren shrugged her embonpoint, smiled malevolently at one side of her mouth, and remarked: "You dare to threaten me?" It was in this scene that the child in the nightie rushed in and that the Columbus Theatre wept.

But "London Life" is excellent of its kind. Its characters are not ridiculous, and its types, "Snitch," "the Microbe," Bertie, Gussie, the "drunken gent," and the "boy" enliven the proceedings. Messrs. Murray and Long have done the Baedeker act on the programme. The scene representing Piccadilly, looking east from Green Park, is described most guide-bookily, with the names of the buildings carefully mentioned, while Fleet street—which looks very much like Houston street in the scene—is prettily mentioned by these educational producers as "the nursing mother of English literature." Shakespeare, Ben Jonson and Goldsmith, says Mr. Murray, are closely associated with this famous street. I hope that the Columbus Theatre people read their programmes.

A good cast helped the play considerably. The Napoleonic Augustus Cook pawned his coat and waistcoat very heroically. Miss Lillian Lamson, said to be a sister of Nance O'Neil, was the siren. Miss Lamson has a host of affectations and a baritone voice that seems to come from her boots. With an adroit manipulation of her talents she might make a very fine actress, for she has temperament. But as the siren in this melodrama she over-reached herself. This young woman with a whole season at a good theatre in New York would undoubtedly be heard from. Miss Florence Stone was extremely good as the heroine. Her work could not be improved upon. Charles Canfield was a villain who looked well and who acted nonchalantly enough to rob the role of its incongruities. Edwin Brewster, who divided his affection between wife and South Africa, was neatly effective, and Richard Gauthony as a gallant colonel-baronet might have been stronger. Miss Jennie Satterlee gave a couple of excellent character sketches, and a cunning little child as a "boy" made a great hit.

"London Life" is well staged and well acted. It is a long time since so satisfactory a melodrama has crept into the metropolis. It is the old story, but the old story graphically put.

ALAN DALE.

MAYOR JONES, OF TOLEDO, AS A POET.

HIS NEW SONG, "INDUSTRIAL FREEDOM."

MAYOR SAMUEL M. JONES, of Toledo, is enlivening things with another of his vigorous and stirring campaigns. Some people call him eccentric, but he is a man of strong personality and of extraordinary ability. Besides being a wealthy manufacturer, with great business responsibilities, he is a musician, a social reformer and an all-around philanthropist. Two years ago he made his first campaign for Mayor, and he enlivened it with music of his own production. He composed a song, "Divide Up the Day." Mrs. Jones set it to music and it was a campaign hit. This year he is a candidate for re-election, and he has a new song, "Industrial Freedom," which goes to the time of "Marching Through Georgia," says the Cincinnati Commercial Tribune.

Mayor Jones is a peculiar figure in the political and public life of Ohio. He is a Christian sociologist, who, after having been elected Mayor of Toledo by the combined votes of the laboring classes and the church-going elements, proceeded to apply to the conduct of public business as far as possible the Golden Rule principle which has distinguished his private life. His ideas, if generally adopted, would revolutionize the social and labor conditions of the country. He advocates and applies to his own business the eight-hour day, pays his employes good wages, enters sympathetically into their personal concerns, and contributes financially and personally for their social enjoyment and improvement.

In the conduct of the vast interests of his business he has the enthusiastic co-operation of every employe. In addition to their regular wages for eight hours' work he pays them a yearly dividend from the profits of the business proportioned to their wages. Every legal holiday means an entertainment or excursion for the employes of his factories; if in Summer, out of doors; if in Winter, indoors.

A year ago he purchased a piece of land adjoining his factory, put a landscape gardener to work, and transformed it into a park, with flower beds and winding cinder paths, with seats and benches under the trees for older people, and swings, Maypole, tennis court and games for children. Then he opened the gates free to the families of the poor of Toledo. He named it Golden Rule Park, and every Sunday in Summer there are good music and good speakers.

Mayor Jones was born in Wales in 1846, and came to the United States with his parents when three years old. His parents were very poor, and it was necessary for the son, when old enough, to go out to work, and he says: "I bear upon my body to-day the marks of the injustice and wrong of child labor." When eighteen years old he heard of the Pennsylvania oil fields, and went to Titusville, which place he reached with fifteen cents in his pocket. He found work, seized the opportunities that were presented and in 1870 became himself an oil producer. In 1886 he came to Ohio and entered the Lima field, and since then has followed the business successfully in Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana.

He made several improvements in appliances for producing oil, and established in Toledo a factory for the manufacture of his inventions. This factory brought him for the first time into contact with the labor conditions of the city. He studied the social problem, and determined to do what he could to better the lives of his employes, both financially and socially. He had the full sympathy and co-operation of his wife. He announced this rule: "Every man is entitled to such a share of the product of his toil as will enable him to live decently and in such a way that he and his children may be fitted to be citizens of the free Republic." In 1895 he established the wage dividend system, and has maintained it ever since. The first was issued on Christmas Day, and the cash was accompanied by a letter breathing a spirit of true Christian fellowship. Since then the employes have been guests several times at his great house, which their work has helped him to build, and where the men and their wives or sisters were treated by Mr. and Mrs. Jones as social equals would be.

INDUSTRIAL FREEDOM.

"And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Tune—"Marching Through Georgia."

Sing aloud the tidings that the race will yet be free,
Man to man the wide world o'er will surely brothers be;
Right to work, the right to live, let every one agree,
God freely gives to the people.

CHORUS.

Hurrah! hurrah! the truth shall make us free,
Hurrah! hurrah! for dear humanity.
Right to work let all proclaim till men united be,
In God's free gift to the people.

Tell the story over to the young and to the old,
Liberty for every man is better far than gold;
In the sweat of labor eat thy daily bread, we're told,
As God's free gift to the people.

Shorter days for those who toil will make more work for all,
For a shorter work day, then, we'll sound a trumpet call,
And thus the fruit of labor on all alike will fall,
As God's free gift to the people.

Let us grant to every man the right to have a share
In the things that God has made as free as sun and air;
Let us have free land for all, then free work everywhere,
God's gift will be to the people.

With justice done to every one, then happy shall we be;
Poverty will disappear, the prisoners will be free;
The right to work, the right to live, the love of liberty—
All God's best gifts to the people.

Man: a Fable.

Once upon a time a man insanely conceived it were Spring, and laid aside his Winter underwear.

The next day it was very cold, and the man, venturing abroad, fell through a coal hole in the sidewalk, whereupon he cursed the weather.

"Had it not turned cold," he exclaimed, "nobody would have had occasion to open his coal hole."

He did not reflect, seemingly, that if he had retained flannels suitable to the season these would have rendered him so large that he couldn't fall through a coal hole.

This fable teaches that men are exceedingly unreasonable, at times.—Detroit Journal.

The Colonial Era.

"Do you think the Government ought to drift into a colonial policy," said the thin young man with a Prince Albert coat.

"Yes, indeed," answered the young woman, vivaciously. "I should think that would be just the thing for the White House. My aunt has a home in the country, and she had nothing but colonial architecture and colonial furniture, and it was too sweetly old-fashioned for anything."—Washington Star.

A Delicate Task.

"I see a light in your study late every night," said the politician's neighbor. "You must be working hard."

"I am."

"Getting up another party platform?"

"No, indeed. I could dash off a party platform in ten minutes. I'm at work now on a conditional acceptance of a political dinner invitation."—Washington Star.

Had Him.

"No," said her father, "you are not the man I want for a son-in-law. Why, I'll bet you never earned a dollar in your life by your own efforts."

"Ah!" exclaimed the young man, brightening up, "there's where you have underestimated me. She bet me a dollar that I wouldn't dare to come here and ask you for her, and, as you know, I have won out."—Chicago News.

Arctic Exploration.

For forty-five years we had been imprisoned by the ice, and our situation was become desperate. It was not likely that we could hold out forty-five years longer.

In this juncture a ship appeared. An officer disembarked and came to us.

"Who are you?" he asked, anxiously.

"We are the Smith party," we replied. "You, doubtless, are our relief expedition."

"No," said the officer, "the Jones party are your relief expedition. We are the relief expedition of the Jones party. So long!"

Merciful heavens! If we were not rescued soon we should be too old to lecture!—Detroit Journal.

One More on the List.

"There are only two things that are sure in this world—death and taxes."

"Oh, I don't know. The seats in the street car are pretty sure to be filled when you start home at night."—Chicago News.